UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,892	10/23/2006	Jean-Noel Thorel	128414	7353
25944 7590 10/05/2010 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3208	50	MILLIGAN, ADAM C		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/583,892	THOREL ET AL.			
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ADAM MILLIGAN	1612			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e			
This application is abandoned in view of:					
Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on	lailing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on				
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	nendment which places the			
(c) ☐ A reply was received on but it does not constitutional rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See €		mpt at a proper reply, to the non-			
(d) 🛮 No reply has been received.					
 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8: (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was), which is after the expiration of the statutory per Allowance (PTOL-85). 	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Transmission dated			
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	e of \$ is due.				
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$	The publication fee, if required by 37	CFR 1.18(d), is \$			
(c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no	ot been received.				
 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requallowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on 					
after the expiration of the period for reply.					
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.					
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. 	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	ignee of the entire interest, or all of			
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.					
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim		e the period for seeking court review			
7. X The reason(s) below:					
Mathew Barthalow confirmed via telephone convers	ation on 9/9/2010 that no respon	se was filed.			
/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/ADAM MILLIGAN/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612				
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to			